UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Announcement

As UNITY goes to press, war in Europe seems imminent. Just twenty-one years after the opening of the first World War, which was fought "to end war," a second World War is at hand.

In anticipation of this dread event, UNITY wishes to announce:

(1) That it will no more be fooled by high-sounding humanitarian slogans in 1935 than it was in 1914! It takes no more stock in Britain's rescue of Ethiopia today than it did of Britain's rescue of Belgium yesterday. This war, if it comes, will be like the last war, when it came—a selfish struggle of selfish empires, for selfish imperial interests.

(2) That it will advocate and support, on principle, in this war as in the last war, a policy of strict neutrality on the part of the United States! It believes that there is no more reason why we should participate in an armed conflict between Britain and Italy today than there was reason why we should participate in the armed conflict between Britain and Germany yesterday. It is certain that, if we enter into this new war, we shall repent our folly as we now repent it in the case of the last war. UNITY will therefore oppose America's entrance into the war for any reason or under any condition.

(3) That it will oppose the war, if America goes into it! UNITY opposed the last war, and suffered suppression because of its fidelity to the ideal of peace. UNITY in the same way will oppose this latest war, if and when it comes to us, and stands ready again to suffer suppression. We know no compromise on this issue, as we recognize no allegiance and will give no obedience to any government that goes to war. The early Christians were right,—"We must obey God rather than men."

UNITY makes this announcement now, to its readers, to the public, and to the government, because it wants no confusion on these points. Furthermore, we find it a source of strength and peace, in the hour of trial, to stand committed, and thus to know our way.

John Haynes Holmes.

VOLUME CXVI NUMBER 3

Chicago, October 7, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 43
Have the American People Forgotten?—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 45
Jottings—J. H. H. 46

ARTICLES—

Liberty!—*C. E. M. Joad* 43
The Paltry General Shop—ELLEN HORUP 47
Shall It Be War?—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 48
Which Way Ahead in Interracial Relations?—FRANCES C. JEFFERS 49
Phun with Phobias—CATHARINE CONRADI 52
Justice for the Non-Religious—FRANK SWANCARA 53

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—

A Challenge to Christianity—ETHEL ROMIG FULLER 54
Merciful Decoration—JOHN URBANEK 54
War Is a Stage—HARRIET MARKHAM GILL 54
A Street Musician—ROBERTA MEYERS 54
A Beggar Answers—FLORENCE EAKMAN 54

THE STUDY TABLE—

War Clouds in the Far East—TARAKNATH DAS 55
Oliver's Secretary—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 56
Good Sermons—J. H. H. 57
"Through a Broken Reed"—LUCIA TRENT 57

CORRESPONDENCE—

An Open Letter to President Roosevelt—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 57
Protests to Russia—C. M. G. 57
From a Friend's Correspondence—M. L. M. 58
"The Fascination of the Sea"—AGNES H. HARDY 58
More Appreciation—DOROTHY L. WILDER 58

THE FIELD—

Prominent Leaders Reject Moderation Policy—*The Union Signal* 42

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Prominent Leaders Reject Moderation Policy

Views of Notable Americans on the Proposed Ten-Year, Nation-Wide Campaign for "Moderate" Use of Alcoholic Liquors, Instead off Total Abstinence Principle

To arrive at a fair appraisal of the Moderation Council's projected ten-year's nation-wide campaign to promote moderate drinking of alcoholic beverages by the American people as a substitute for total abstinence, the following questions were submitted by Mrs. Grant M. Hudson, director of the department of Christian Citizenship of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to a large number of leaders in various fields and in widely separated parts of the country:

1. Should enlightened Christian and allied thought in America abandon the support of total abstinence from alcoholic liquors as a principle of personal attitude toward intoxicants, and henceforth favor and encourage a policy of habitual, "moderate" indulgence in these beverages?

2. In your opinion, how would such organized encouragement and adoption of the "moderate" drinking attitude as a universal policy for the American public affact, (1) the solution of the motor traffic accident problem; (2) social welfare in our large centers; (3) industrial efficiency; (4) the future of youth and American ideals of family life; (5) college life; (6) education and religious progress?

Interesting and significant replies have been received, most of them at great length, but space permits only extracts from a few:

Mary E. Woolley, President, Mount Holyoke College: "The movement to meet the drink evil by education I thoroughly approve. I am not, however, in favor of education for moderate drinking, as I am convinced that total abstinence is the only safe position."

Arthur Barnhart, Lawyer, Chicago: "I regard 'moderate' drinking as the worst phase of the liquor problem."

Albert W. Beaven, D.D., LL.D., President, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.: "The only people I see who will gain by a widespread propaganda for the use

(*Continued on page* 58)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVI MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1935 No. 3

LIBERTY!

"One thing is certain. If the advocates of liberal ideas meet violence with violence, denunciation with denunciation, bitterness with bitterness, they will find that they have assisted in generating an atmosphere in which power is unconstitutionally seized by a forceful minority and liberty is consigned to the limbo of the outmoded shibboleths of an obsolete democracy. To meet the new forces of violence and hysteria with violence and hysteria is for the friends of liberty to betray their cause from the outset. Defend liberty coolly and with reasoned argument; show that the advantages which a free community enjoy far outweigh the disadvantages which attend its enjoyment, and your advocacy, I am convinced, has a good chance of winning an enlightened public opinion."

C. E. M. Joad, in *Liberty Today.*

The fight against war is in one respect at least different from any other fight against evil of which we can think. We refer to the fact that in this fight practically everybody is against the evil in question. Compare this situation with that which inheres in the fight against liquor, for example. In this latter case, there are millions of persons who like liquor, want liquor, insist upon having liquor though the law be defied and the Constitution be made "a scrap of paper." These people, a majority of the population in many places, do not even recognize liquor as an evil. They even defend and patronize the traffic as the means of getting the drinks without which they think that life is not worth the living. Now, there is no such attitude toward war as this! Nobody wants war, or insists upon having it. There are interests, of course, that profit from war, as brewers and distillers profit from the traffic in alcoholic beverages. There are professions which live upon war, or preparations for war, as bar-tenders live upon patronage in liquor. But there is no great mass of the population, or any considerable fraction thereof, which says that war is a good thing. The same thing applies to other evils. Slavery, for example, had one great section of this country absolutely wedded to its support and maintenance. Infanticide had the sanction of philosophers as exalted as Plato. The subjection of women had the approval of millions up to and beyond the very hour of the granting of suffrage, and general social and legal emancipation. But Mars has no friend—none, at any rate, who is willing to confess himself as such! War is as universally abhorred today as disease. We would rid the world of it as we would rid the world of cancer. And yet, with such unanimity of opposition, we seem to make little or no progress against it. What fatality rests upon us that we cannot conquer and destroy this horror?

It is a long time since we have read anything on the peace question as wise and penetrating as the speech of Mr. de Valera, President of the Irish Free State, on the Abyssinian question at Geneva. If only as a world-forum for such an utterance, the League of Nations is justified. Especially as coming from a man who has been a good fighter in his day, and is therefore no pacifist, are his words significant. Mr. de Valera's entire speech before the Assembly was masterly, but especially important was the following passage:

> Are adjustments never to be made but at the expense of the weak? Why cannot the peace conference which will meet in Europe after the next conflict has decimated the nations, and disaster and exhaustion have tamed some of them into temporary submission, why cannot this conference be convened now, when calmness and reason might have a chance?

If anything could be more sensible than this proposal, we should like to hear it. In any dispute between nations, argues Mr. de Valera, a peace conference will be held in any case. Why not hold it, then, before the fighting instead of after? This fighting cannot help on the cause of justice and amity; it cannot create any conditions conducive to reason; it cannot settle any question involved. On the contrary, it can only leave all questions quite as unsettled as when the fighting began, and stir up passions, enmities, and hatreds which make reason and right impossible. The only thing that this fighting can determine is the ascendancy of one nation over another, and in entering a war every nation hopes to win this ascendancy. But even when won, as Mr. de Valera points out, it is "temporary." Look at Germany, beaten down and thrown into chains at Versailles, and now more powerful than ever! Can any one imagine a Versailles Conference held in 1914 instead of 1919 which would not have served much better the interests of all the nations concerned than the actual Versailles? No, fighting never brings peace—it only destroys it. Peace may be made at the beginning, never at the end.

The recent meetings of the Nazis in Nurnberg marked developments of momentous significance in the

third Reich. As we study the things said and done by these gatherings in the great memorial field in the ancient city, in which we wandered and pondered on a certain June day, we can seem to feel the tightening of the coils of a serpent around the helpless body of Germany. The people of that country have had little enough liberty since Hitler took power, and now they have less than ever. The first thing achieved was the complete absorption of the German government by the National Socialist Party. In Russia, and even in Italy, there has always been preserved some vestige of distinction between government and party, but in Germany this last vestige is now gone. The Nazis *are* the government! Secondly, the Reichstag committed complete and therefore final suicide at Nurnberg. The Reichstag has been a mere shadow ever since 1933, but even this shadow is now gone. Henceforth, in grim reality, it is the Fuehrer who will rule the state. Thirdly, the Jewish policy of the Nazis was wrought out to the uttermost logic of its horror. All Jews are now legally as well as socially reduced, by the withdrawal of their citizenship, to the rank of helots, and the ghetto thus established as the sole refuge, within Germany itself, of this stricken people. Lastly, the national German flag was officially displaced by the Swastika, as the symbol that all the past is dead, and the new alone alive. Thus has the brown revolution swung full circle! One marvels, as one sees the completion of this process, at the extent of Hitler's triumph. Where are the millions of Social Democrats and Communists who once opposed him? Where are the monarchists who in the beginning were so strong that it was freely prophesied that the Fuehrer would have to restore the Hohenzollerns to sustain his rule? Where are the workers, of whose "unrest" we hear so much? The terror partly answers these questions. But the real answer is Germany's glad acceptance of Hitler as the maker of the new and greater glory of the land. We are mad in our endeavor to explain Hitler, unless we recognize that the people are as much with him as the Italians are with Mussolini. Most Germans today are embracing the serpent's coils!

The depression still remains the great unsolved mystery. Thus, in his widely discussed letter to Roy Howard, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, President Roosevelt referred to the depression as past and gone. The next day General Hugh Johnson lamented in a public speech that unemployment was as bad as ever. The General's gloom would seem to have been more than justified, as the employment index of the Department of Labor has gone down steadily since April. This index is confirmed by the Federation of Labor's figures, which estimate 11,000,000 unemployed as compared with 10,122,000 in October, 1933. The National Research League puts the unemployment total at 14,210,000, as compared with 13,330,000 in October, 1933. If the depression is over—and the stock market confirms the opinion of the President!—what good does it do to be prosperous? Again, on September 9th last, the American Federation of Labor proclaimed the biggest business upswing since the depression began. It pointed out that dividend payments in August exceeded last year by $11,000,000, and that the steel business and the automobile industry were booming. "The last four months of 1935," said the Federation, "may well bring the highest level of industrial operations . . . since 1930." Yet on the same day, and in the same newspapers which carried the Federation's statement, it was announced in a Washington despatch that the figures of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, checked up through May, showed that ten per cent of the nation's population were on government relief, "a greater proportion of the national population than had been on relief previously at any time during the depression, with the exception of the mid-winter months of 1934-35. The decline since January . . . is due primarily to seasonal factors." Well, there you have it! What does it mean? We confess we don't know, unless it be that private industry is now so completely severed from public interest that wealth is henceforth to grow in exact proportion to poverty—the prosperity of the owners in exact proportion to the misery of the workers. This means, of course, not the recovery of capitalism at all, but its debacle, as prophesied by Karl Marx in his "Das Kapital."

It is tremendously encouraging to see how the fight against the sales tax is rolling up in this country. The campaign against it is well organized in New Jersey, and is practically certain now to secure the repeal of the tax at the next meeting of the new legislature elected this fall, and to achieve the defeat of Gov. Hoffman, who foisted the iniquitous levy upon the electorate. This campaign is rapidly entering into other communities similarly afflicted, and may be counted upon in due course to accomplish everywhere its end. The spread of the sales tax in recent months has been precisely like the spread of a pestilence. Its effects are like those of the plague—utterly devastating and disastrous to the helpless masses of the people. The reason for the contagion is of course obvious. The tax is sublimely easy to levy, and, being an indirect tax, is not recognized by those who pay it until they do some thinking about it. Its abomination is to be found in the fact that it is one more, and only the latest, device for swatting the poor. Under the operations of our beneficent economic and political system, it is these poor, the hard-pressed workers, who are made to carry all the burdens, and here is a perfect example. The common man spends all his income, and thus is taxed by the sales tax on every dollar he earns. The rich man, on the other hand, spends only a fraction

of his income for commodities, and thus is to a large extent not reached by the sales tax at all. Furthermore, the poor man buys invariably in small quantities, and thus is taxed by a 2 per cent sales tax as high as 10, 15 and 20 per cent on every little purchase. The rich man, per contra, buys in large quantities, and thus pays the smallest and not the largest percentage on each cost price. The supreme irony and iniquity of the tax is to be found in the fact that millions of men and women *on relief* are regularly paying this tax which in most places has been established as a levy to sustain relief! Wipe it out! Such a tax has no place in a democracy!

Evidence multiplies that, at the very time when government is apparently extending its functions to unheard-of lengths, the people are finding ways of dispensing with government altogether. Or so it seems! Thus, in our recent presidential elections, the *Literary Digest* polls have seemed to make quite superfluous the actual voting of the citizens. Weeks before the official casting of the ballots, the *Digest* sends out its questionnaires to millions of men and women in all sections of the land. Steadily, until election day, the vote rolls up, and infallibly forecasts the outcome of the struggle. The election, in other words, simply confirms a result already secured by the enterprise of a popular magazine. Why, therefore, go through all the trouble, and incur all the expense, of such an election? Another illustration of this same process has been furnished by the 50 lawyers, appointed by the Liberty League, who recently declared by unanimous report that the Wagner Labor Bill was unconstitutional. This would seem to make the Supreme Court an unnecessary appendage of government. Nine justices supported at large expense, a magnificent building erected in Washington—all for nothing! Whenever a constitutional question arises, appoint a volunteer committee of lawyers to pass upon the issue, and the thing is done. Still again, there is the impressive phenomenon of the vigilantes in California. This is a volunteer guard of men who have undertaken to maintain law and order in territories affected by labor disputes. These men, fully armed, patrol any given district, arrest striking workingmen, run out union organizers, beat up outside "agitators," and in general run things to suit themselves. This is obviously taking over the functions of the police and military—so why have either? Thus does government become more and more superfluous, in an age when so many private citizens are willing voluntarily to take on all responsibility. What wonder that, in the end, government as due legal process ends, and one man—a Mussolini or a Hitler—does everything?

The death of Huey Long will not be forgotten, if only because it removed one of the most formidable political figures in the life of the American people. It should be remembered, also, for certain lessons that it may teach the nation and the world. One certainly is that assassination, if determined, is unpreventable. A ghastly and outrageous weapon of offense, there is as little defense against it as against air-raids in wartime. No man was ever more carefully and ceaselessly guarded than Senator Long, but the assassin got him. It is this dreadful fact which makes Hitler's policy in Germany wiser than that of Stalin and Mussolini. Stalin is almost never seen in public—he remains immured in the Kremlin. Mussolini's precautions against personal attack are so elaborate as to be fantastic. But Hitler goes everywhere, and with a guard so inconspicuous, almost so negligible, as to be astounding. He seems to trust the people—and may be right! A second lesson to be drawn from the Long tragedy is the old, familiar but always terrible truth that violence begets violence. Senator Long was not an assassin of men's bodies, but he was of their reputations, political positions, and economic security. He was as ruthless to his enemies as he was kind and generous to his friends. No dictator ever ruled with so utter a disregard of fair play. When he desired to destroy, he struck—and sooner or later there was bound to be a blow in return. No one can justify this blow, but it can and must be explained in scientifically ethical terms. Lastly, there is the lesson that accident and personal will play an enormous role in the drama of human affairs. There are those who would reduce all events in history to rigid processes of natural law. There are others who would explain everything as the result of impersonal political and economic forces. Senator Long was a politician of tremendous power in this country, and threatened to play the decisive part in the critical presidential election of 1936. And now, through a single revolver shot fired by a madman, the whole scene is changed. The fabric of human affairs may be torn more fortuitously than we commonly imagine.

Have the American People Forgotten?

Little Dorothy had been naughty. Punishment was plainly called for. Her mother said, "It grieves Mamma very much to have to punish her own little girl." The youngster's comment was sagacious beyond her years: "I's very sorry, Mamma, but you bringed it all on yourse'f."

Parental discipline would doubtless often be different if it were compelled to face the antecedents and implications of the moral obliquity which it seeks to eradicate.

It is well, in appraising the situation in American society, not to forget whose chickens are coming home

to roost in the industrial and financial wreckage of these times. Economic and political groups formerly in control who showed a retiring, not to say shamefaced, disposition when the first horrors of the carnival of the nineteen-twenties were contemplated, have latterly quite overcome their embarrassment, and are stepping forward in the role of saviors of society.

There are numerous visionary and devious proposals advanced by way of achieving this salvation. Thoughtful voters who once saw promise of a new deal in the measures projected by the administration at Washington are now restive, and question some of these measures seriously. But the most fatuous of all the current proposals would seem to be the restoration of the status quo ante, the return to the economic and political aims and methods of the nineteen-twenties.

Yet some of the most powerful economic groups, and certain political groups once powerful, who are now among the most clamorous critics of the administration and its policies, seem to have only such a proposal to offer. With no show of regeneration, and with but the slightest evidence of chastening repentance, they boisterously demand that affairs be once more committed to their domination.

There is, to be sure, considerable evidence of dissatisfaction with the particular kind of new deal which is being passed out, but is there lack of evidence that the American people demand a new deal of some sort? It would seem fatuous indeed to assume that the lesson of the nineteen-twenties has already been forgotten, and that the same leadership and the same economic and political policies which brought on the debacle are now to be reinstated. Surely no degree of desperation can move the American people to that piece of folly.

Here is a powerful financial institution of that era, still operating under substantially the same leadership, and displaying no conclusive evidence of regeneration, whose representative, when backed into a corner, is compelled to say in effect: "Yes, those securities which we pressed upon the attention of our customers, and for which we ardently solicited investors, are now practically worthless. Nor can we truthfully claim that they will ever be worth more than from 30 to 60 per cent of what our customers paid for them. At the time that we offered them to our patrons we knew that they failed to meet the ordinary tests of sound investment. We can now only explain that we went crazy along with others. But here we are doing business at the old stand and along the old lines, and we ask you to join us in denouncing what we consider the hair-brained measures of finance now promulgated from Washington. We assure you that nothing can save the country except a return to the conditions which prevailed before these tyros and meddlers were entrusted with power."

The re-emergence of such groups and their assertion of claims to renewed economic and political leadership, will probably do more to confirm the present administration in power than any event which might transpire. The country is not satisfied with what is going on in Washington, but certainly nothing has transpired to soften its horror of the nineteen-twenties and of the train of woes which followed the muddling and over-reaching of the leadership of those days. The last resort which will occur to thoughtful citizens is the re-instatement of that leadership.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

We fear that the Unconquered Lion of Judah, Emperor of Ethiopia, is going to be conquered. But there are times when one had rather be a dead lion, like Haile Selassie, than a live dog, like Mussolini.

Nothing can excuse Italy in Ethiopia. But, for our own health, it may be well for us to remember England in South Africa, Germany in Kiaochow, France in Morocco—and the United States in Panama!

The real reason behind Mussolini's war on Ethiopia, we are told, is Italy's need of more territory for her expanding population. But after losing a million men in conquering Ethiopia, Italy won't need the territory, except for graves! So why not dump a million unneeded citizens into the Adriatic, and be done with it?

"Stocks Up on War Threat"

—Headline in New York *World-Telegram.*

The fundamental indecency of contemporary commercial life is nowhere more convincingly shown than by the action of stocks when war is imminent. In the face of utter disaster, the stock market booms!

We have realized for a long time that the trend of events was against the President, but we never realized how serious the situation was for Mr. Roosevelt until we read that "Jimmy" Walker is coming home to campaign for his re-election!

Ethiopia, it is announced, "has no public debt." So Mussolini is right, after all! That country is not civilized.

J. H. H.

The Paltry General Shop

[From Our Special Correspondent at Geneva.]

Nowadays when no one knows what he wants and the majority want nothing, Mussolini is the man of the moment. Whilst the others, like snails in dry weather, have crept into the shelter of their houses and barred the entrance, Mussolini has ventured out into the middle of the road. Only those who want something attain something.

Look at the Japanese! They wanted to have Manchuria. While they took it, they told the League of Nations that they were not taking it. When, a year later, the League of Nations got to know through its committee what it had known all along, i. e., that Japan had taken Manchuria, it was finally necessary to come to a determination. And the League decided to deny facts and not to recognize Japan's conquest of Manchuria. Japan, proud of her victory, got offended and left. Members of the League, who had made much money by selling arms to Japan during the war about which they knew nothing until it was over, now turned to concluding trade agreements with Japan in Manchuria which they did not recognize as belonging to Japan.

Japan is the prototype. If only one wants something, then one gets it. So now Mussolini wants to have Abyssinia and he has already begun to be a hero merely because he wants something.

The League of Nations wants nothing, for the League of Nations is nothing. No league of nations results merely because a number of representatives of capitalist governments are assembled under the same roof. The meaning of the word shows this. A league is an association whose object is a common course of action founded upon common interests. But the members of the League of Nations have no interests in common. Each one sees only the interests of his own country. Each merely haggles about his own country's advantage. "You let me escape condemnation when I am a bandit, and then I'll support you when you are one." That is the principle, and thereby a common course of action is precluded. It is on this principle all their talks of either peace or justice are based. The history of the League can teach this to anyone who will allow himself to be informed.

The League of Nations has a pact which the nations have all signed. The most important clause, Article 15, forbids them to carry on war. Then, none the less, they do so carry on war, some prefer to remain in the League, others to leave. It is of no consequence whatsoever whether those who fight leave the League and those who sell them arms remain members, or vice versa.

Now also Mussolini threatens to leave if the matter of Ethiopia comes up before the League. But since in any case the League of Nations does not use the means it has to prevent him attacking Abyssinia, it does not make the slightest difference whether he remains or resigns. Since his threats, like his promises, are nothing else than mere words, he stayed nevertheless when Abyssinia, after two vain applications, nominally came before the League of Nations in the role of China.

In reality everything has taken place outside the League. Whilst the Great Powers negotiated in the hotels, the Little Powers sat and waited, only to learn that the Great Powers had decided to meet again on September 4th. When they had been sent home, the Great Powers continued the negotiations and, in spite of Mussolini's protest, brought the treaty of 1906 out into the light of the day.

In Article 1 thereof, England, France and Italy agreed to maintain a political and territorial *status quo* in Abyssinia. Nothing was to depreciate the sovereign rights of the Emperor of Abyssinia. The three powers further pledged themselves not to meddle with each others' affairs. According to Article 3, they must remain neutral during internal events in that country and "under no circumstances may any one of the three governments intervene except with the consent of the others." In the case of disagreement, none may take action whilst negotiations are in process.

Menelik, the emperor at that time, was not consulted. When the agreement was sent him, he, with dignity, replied: "This agreement has been made in defiance of Our Sovereign Power, and no word in it is binding upon us."

In 1919 Italy, probably behind France's back, proposed to England an agreement regarding mutual support (in opposition to the government of Abyssinia) *in re* the Italian railways and the English damming of Lake Tsana. But England did not consider the proposal sufficiently advantageous.

Then in 1923 Italy and France recommended, in the most appreciative and selected phrases, that Abyssinia should be invited to join the League of Nations. The French delegate, Jouvenal, concluded with an earnest appeal for it to be done at once: "For if, in a year's time, something or other should happen on the Abyssinian frontiers which in those regions would perhaps be settled by violence, then this resort to violence would be upon the head of the League of Nations, because it had not made up its mind in time. . . . It is not enough to secure peace in one's own country. The freedom of the nations of Africa and Europe must also be ensured. National freedom today lies in the hands of the League of Nations." There, indeed, it is in good hands!

Two years after these fair words England again brought up the Nile question with Mussolini. It was shortly after the murder of Mateotti. Mussolini sat less firmly in the saddle and England took advantage of this. They forthwith came to terms and sent Ras Taffari the agreement. They got the following reply: "The fact that you have come to terms and that you jointly inform me of your agreement, is evidence that the intention is coercion, which, in my view, is in contradiction to what was said to me on my entry into the League of Nations: 'Members of this league cannot enter into separate agreements in order to force their ideas upon another member!'" And Ras Taffari demanded that the question be brought before the League.

After some reassuring explanations and apologies, the matter was put right in the autumn of 1926. From that moment there were no limits to Italy's friendliness. Ras Taffari received a decoration which made him akin to the King of Italy, and Mussolini signed a pact of friendship to last for twenty years.

Then, in 1933, Mussolini began to prepare for war by a first draft of troops and arms. In November, 1934, the first clash occurred and after having discarded

all phrases about his motives of civilizing Abyssinia, he no longer concealed the fact that his intention was to make Asbyssinia an Italian protectorate owing to the over-population of Italy that he himself had done everything to encourage.

Before the meeting of the Council in Geneva was ended, England confirmed the right of the League of Nations to deal with the matter on the basis of Article 15 of the Pact, and during the later negotiations England began to send troops to British Somaliland in order to protect her "interests," as it is called. Simultaneously a *ballon d'essai,* entitled Abyssinia under "collective mandate exercised by the League of Nations," was issued amidst the singing of the international variation of the famous song: "There stood three rogues and laid their plans."

It is hard to tell what the result of this will be when the Council meets next time. Only one thing is certain: Justice there will not be, for that presupposes unanimity regarding the maintenance of the League's Pact, and such a unanimity cannot be found in a paltry general shop.

ELLEN HORUP.

Geneva, Switzerland.

Shall It Be War?

[*From Our English Correspondent.*]

If Britain goes to war against Italy it is unlikely to be called a war—*at first.* All will probably be done "decently" through the machinery of Geneva.

The Archbishop of York has made this clear. In a broadcast address on Sunday he said that if the League of Nations took action it might lead to war—"or at any rate to fighting."

> I make that distinction, said the Archbishop, because for the League to employ force against an aggressive member is no more "war" in the proper sense of the word than a baton-charge by the police against a mob engaged in destruction is a riot on the part of the police.—(*"Daily Herald"* report, Sept. 2, 1935.

Some of us will have our own opinions about police and baton-charges, but we will let that pass. The thing to notice is that we are back in 1914, when the Church blessed our tanks and guns because they were to be used in a "war to end war."

Once more from the relative security of a Cathedral Town comes the voice of the Church Militant, to tell us that poison gas and aerial bombardment are not the same when used by agreement among the robber Powers.

A man killed by a League bullet is not, as it were, so dead as a man killed by any ordinary bullet.

> The family (says the Archbishop, referring to Eden, Baldwin, Laval and Co.) must take steps . . . and for the sake of love itself it may at times be necessary to exercise severity.

Next comes the voice of Mr. Kean, in his presidential address to the Trade Union Congress at Margate.

Following the lead already given by the Labor and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions in urging "sanctions" by the League of Nations, Mr. Kean said:

> There are formidable powers of coercion to be applied in the economic sanctions of the League. They are clearly stated in Article XVI of the Covenant. They constitute a compound group of economic, financial, and military measures. . . .
>
> It is a grave responsibility to counsel measures which may cause war. But what is the alternative, from the Trade Union standpoint, to this policy? War is a certainty, anyway, unless Italy is restrained.—(*"Evening Standard,"* Sept. 2, 1935.)

It is for these "sanctions" against Italy—for measures taken by their own Imperialist Governments which they know and admit may lead to a world war—that the leaders of the Trade Union Movement, the Social Democrats and our own Labor Party are clamoring.

To our Imperialists this "present from Margate" is an offer to sacrifice the youth of this country—the youth of our factories and workshops—that they may perish in the shambles of another gangster vendetta.

Having received their orders from headquarters, the Communists have also charged madly into the fray with a blind discipline worthy of the Light Brigade.

They are supporting the position of the L. S. I. and the I. F. T. U. without reservation, and their associated bodies (such as the British Movement against War and Fascism) have obediently fallen in line, advocating in particular the closing of the Suez Canal, which could only be made effective in so far as it was supported by the British fleet and our army of occupation in Egypt.

Pressed upon the point that this involves our support for the Imperialist Governments which are to carry out these "sanctions," they tell you that actions carried out by such Governments under pressure from the working class constitute working-class action!

Or, in other words, if the closing of the Suez Canal involves us in war with Italy, it will be a working-class war because the Second and Third Internationals have supported that policy—just as the World War was a working-class war because the Trade Unions supported their Governments. . . .!

In face of this formidable United Front consisting of half the present Cabinet, the Archbishop of York, the Labor Party, the League of Nations' Union and the Communists, the I. L. P. has a tremendous task to fulfil.

Where Italy and Abyssinia are concerned there is no question as to rights and wrongs. The aim of Italy's Fascist Government is the brutal subjugation and exploitation of Ethiopia. How, then, can that best be prevented?

In 1914 men died to save "gallant little Belgium" and Serbia, threatened by the bullying Imperialists of Austria-Hungary. No Socialist denies the viciousness of the Kaiser's Government or that of the Hapsburgs, and the violation of Belgian neutrality is a historical fact.

Yet those who died to save Belgium were only pawns of the makers of Secret Treaties and the Peace of Versailles. Millions were murdered to swell the victorious Empires and give us Hitler in place of the Kaiser. Only in Russia, where men revolted against the War, came any good out of it.

"But," say the Sanctionists, "there will be no war; the threat will be sufficient." Disraeli knew that game before they were born, and was more successful at it than they are ever likely to be.

At the Congress of Berlin he was determined to save Turkey from Russia for reasons very much like

those which make Eden anxious to "save" Abyssinia from Italy. Disraeli blustered and bluffed—and the Czar climbed down in a way that Mussolini is unlikely to imitate.

Disraeli then came home, having achieved "Peace with Honor" (how the *Daily Herald* would have applauded him!) but in his pocket was Cyprus—a little gift from the Sultan in recognition of the services of the British Lion. So I wonder what our services may cost Ethiopia.

Do not let us forget that even while the Labor Party has been shouting for sanctions against Mussolini, there has been war on the North-West frontier of India, in which the British Empire (Chief Constable of the Geneva Police!) has been defending its loot and attacking its neighbors.

Let us remember, then, the words of the Internationale: "Our own right arm the chains must sever."

If they will it, the workers can still defeat Mussolini and every other war-monger. If the Transport Workers refuse to handle all munitions or supplies intended for war purposes, whether by Italy or any other Imperialist Government, the power of the war-mongers can be broken.

But that means the solidarity of the masses throughout the world behind these workers in their struggle, with the fullest moral and financial support.

That policy alone, even at this eleventh hour, is consistent with Socialist ideology.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

Which Way Ahead in Interracial Relations?

The Change of Front in Relations Between the Negro and White in America During the Past Decade.

Nearly two years ago, on the morning of November 29, 1933, newspapers all over the United States carried headlines concerning three lynchings. Only one had occurred the day before, but the aftermath of the other two was still front-page stuff.

Ten years ago word of a lynching was headline material for not more than a day or so. The facts of the case were given, the orgiastic elements played up, and the affair forgotten. But during the week at the end of November, 1933, there were opinions bandied about as to the rights of the people to take the law into their own hands. Two governors, an ex-President and various state officials, as well as attorney-generals, sheriffs, state-troopers, et cetera, expressed themselves publicly. Organizations drew up resolutions or their leaders acted as spokesmen.

Several factors have been at work during the past ten years which have, consciously or otherwise, militated towards the change of public opinion in regard to lynching. The forces for law and order have always theoretically been against mob rule. But these organized forces have been so strongly governed by public opinion that more than a formal attempt at resisting a mob was futile. There was never any thought that the lynchers would be brought to trial; today the doubt still remains, but at least the issue has been raised. A good office-holder would not have wished to lose his position by supporting a somewhat illusive ideal which was cherished by none of his constituents. The question of mob action *per se* was debated in California—after the lynching had been done. No one would condone the crime of kidnapping, but the mob itself kidnapped the prisoners from the law, which would undoubtedly have seen that full justice was done. For the father of the young man who had been kidnapped and killed by the two mob victims, grief was augmented and not diminished by the action of the lynchers. And surely his was the right of revenge.

The other two lynchings were of Negroes, as happens in more than three-fourths of the cases in the United States. That in St. Joseph, Missouri, would be called "typical" by a Southerner. (N. B. Less than one-fourth of all lynchings executed have been for accusations of rape or attempted rape.)

A Negro accused of rape was taken from the jail after an attempt at protection by the deputies, was hanged to a tree near the courthouse (in the shadow of justice) and his body burned while a mob cheered and shouted. That the racial factor was the primary one is shown by the fact that a white man accused of a similar crime was lodged in the jail at the same time and unmolested by the mob. Whether more than a very formal attempt will be made to apprehend the lynchers remains to be seen.

But the case in Maryland illustrated clearly factors which have been at work in Negro-white relations in the United States during the past ten years. In this connection it will be well to review hastily certain aspects of the "Negro problem."

The black was brought to America for economic reasons: his labor was necessary on the plantations of the South and elsewhere. The first slaves were treated comparatively well and could in time buy their freedom if they were thrifty. But as the numbers increased, conditions became more rigid and the life of the slave more miserable. Sporadic uprisings of groups of slaves only tended to make more strict the regulations and more harsh the punishments for any disobedience or rebellion. By the time of the Civil war the Black Belt across the South had come into existence, a section in which the Negro population outnumbered the white. The fear on the part of the white man in this district lest he might not be able to keep his supremacy was present in lesser degree throughout the South. The myth of the dangerous black man was maintained in order to squelch any efforts at leniency which would encourage the Negro to think of equal rights. The horror of the Reconstruction period lay chiefly in its blow to the pride of the white man and the temporary overthrow of his carefully built up scheme of supremacy. By resort to force and by enactment of conniving legislation he saw to it that this period was hastily brought to an end. Today the force of custom, tradition and legend is counted on "to keep the Negro in his place." Lynchings are, of course, regarded as necessary when a black man harms a white either

in person or property.* In addition to the record of eight hundred and seven Negroes lynched between 1889 and 1930, there are many additional cases even today of Negroes who are shot and hanged because of refusals to work or quarrels. The importance of the economic feature cannot be too strongly emphasized in a consideration of the Negro problem—past, present *and* future.

From slave days on the cause of the Negro in America has always attracted a few friends among the whites. One of the reasons why the black made a good slave was his general lack of aggressiveness and his loyalty to his white masters. These are not qualities which will secure for a minority people their rights against a "superior" majority. The first friends of the Negro were earnest souls who believed that, as human beings, the blacks should have opportunity for mental and religious instruction. The Quakers were among the earliest to come out strongly against slavery as an institution. After the Civil War many Northerners went to the South to found schools for the education of the recently freed Negro. This was of course a type of home missionary work, with all the patronage and sentimentality thus implied, but the zeal of the workers resulted in a start at secondary education for the Negro in the South, where he was banned from colleges and given the most meager grammar and high school facilities.

In 1919 the Commission on Interracial Cooperation came into existence. Dr. W. W. Alexander has headed this work for a number of years and interracial groups have been set up in every Southern state and in 800 counties. Their work is to aid the Negro in educational enterprises, health facilities, civic advantages and in influencing public opinion and legislation in his behalf. They have organized women's groups to propagandize against lynching and have done research resulting in a booklet on "Lynchings and What They Mean." The Department on Race Relations of the Federal Council of Churches, headed by Dr. George Haynes, has worked with the Commission by interesting church groups in the Negro problem. Sociologists throughout the South are heartily in favor of the work the Commission is doing in making contacts and in educating public opinion on the Negro.

In its central office the above Commission is under white leadership, but the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, on the other hand, was started under joint leadership of Negro and white and today its best known advocates—W. E. B. DuBois, Walter White, and James Weldon Johnson who was a former Secretary of the Association—are Negroes. The N. A. A. C. P. is concerned with the struggle for jobs and economic opportunity; gives legal defense in matters of discrimination, lynching, segregation and testing of votes; has done much work in the investigation of lynchings and sponsoring of anti-lynching bills; and carries on educational propaganda through conferences, meetings and distribution of literature, with the *Crisis* as its monthly publication.

*It is interesting to note that Negroes are safest per ten thousand from lynchings in the Black Belt counties and are in greatest danger from mobs in counties where the proportion of Negroes is less than one-fourth.

The National Urban League is another organization under joint control which deals especially with social service work and research among Negroes.

Organizations with religious motivation, such as the Y. W. C. A., the Y. M. C. A., and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, have been working among student groups for some ten or twelve years and encouraging the establishment of interracial student forums and conferences in the South.

Philanthropy has given much support in the establishment of schools for Negroes. Under this heading would come the Phelps-Stokes Fund, the Slater and Jeanes Funds and the Julius Rosenwald Fund. The General Education Board and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial among others have contributed large sums for Negro education.

In addition, scattered throughout the country are to be found individuals who because of private convictions are working in their own way to foster better interracial conditions.

But in the last three or four years more boisterous protagonists have entered the field. From the flare of trumpets, a startled onlooker would be led to believe that the Communists are the first and only champions that the Negro, sore oppressed by the capitalists, has ever had. The tactics of the Communist differ quite radically from those of the Negro's other friends, who, while seeking justice, have been for the most part peacemakers. The Communists are not interested in pouring oil on troubled waters. Nay, if they can get the water to boil more fiercely, all the better for their purposes. Their goal is *revolution*—the education of the masses will have to come afterward if need be.

Critics of these enthusiasts have not been slow to arise and add their voices to the general hubbub. However, even those to whom Communist doctrine is most distasteful must give the devil his due. The dramatization of the Scottsboro case and its attendant publicity was no mean achievement toward the cause of justice in the United States. Within the Communist Party itself the attempts to put the Negro and white laborer on an equal industrial, political and social basis, and the struggle to crush white chauvinism (the aristocratic proletarian phrase for a feeling of white superiority) are more than enough to win the support of a minority race. That the Negro has not responded in full force long before this is the marvel. But the vision of a revolution just ahead does not enthrall him. He is not enticed as they

> . . . call forth for struggle all the revolutionary forces generated by this national oppression of the Negroes, link them up with the rising forces of the proletarian class struggles under the leadership of the Communist Party, and thus with multiplied capacity for effective battle against the oppressors, the imperialist bourgeoisie, we will "sail into the face of the storm" of the revolutionary mass struggles that are being prepared in America on a gigantic scale.

The Negro is a little more familiar with certain aspects of the "face of the storm" than are his passionate friends: he more or less vaguely realizes that traditional beliefs, fears, prejudices of several generations' standing will not be wiped out overnight by something like a giant mass meeting.

As Walter White pointed out in 1931, in an article on "The Negro and the Communists" in *Harper's Magazine*, the soil of depression was then

ripe for radical doctrine. By this time the soil is even more thoroughly prepared. The economic struggle has been constantly growing more bitter and the competition for work more intense until the Negro in some cases pays for a job with his life if a white man can fill the place. The feeling—a direct descendant of slave-day superiority—is that no Negro should work while a white man remains unemployed. The Negro might follow the example of his comrade the Communist in industry, but he is scarcely rash enough to hope for equality of opportunity by waving a red flag in the face of his employer, having a suspicion that this same employer's reactions would not be unlike those of a bull under similar circumstances.

On the other hand, how are the peace-loving friends of the Negro helping him today? The Communists rush in where angels fear to tread: this is perhaps their chief contribution—and perhaps their only one—to the Negro's cause. Laying aside for the moment all thoughts of their possible motivation for party reasons, their exaltation of the Negro just because he is a Negro, their stupendous ignorance which results in monumentally stupid technical blunders, and their extravagant revolutionary jargon—forgetting all this for a moment, it is not to be denied that the Communists have more than the full courage of their convictions. They do not know the meaning of the word "hesitation." To say a thing is to mean it and to carry it out in practice immediately. Are all men—*working* men, that is—brothers? The Communist nominates a black comrade for Vice-president of the United States, he organizes huge parades against indignities of Negroes, and he raises money to send lawyers down into the South to defend a group of young black men in trouble. What more could he do?

This same rashness on the part of the Communist naturally has its unfortunate reaction on the very goals at which he is supposedly aiming. At Scottsboro, passion against the Communist and his methods was too often aroused in the minds of liberal-minded people rather than the needed passion for social justice on the part of the Negro. The bi-racial conflict appeared to be between the Jew and the Southerner instead of between Negro and white. A little tact and diplomacy might have awarded a different result, but these words are again not in the Communist's vocabulary.

The "angel" organizations during the past decade have undoubtedly helped the Negro to make some very definite steps forward; progress in school and college facilities, spread of welfare agencies, decrease of lynchings, improvement in the political situation and in court justice, spread of interracial co-operation and the slow education of public opinion. It must not be overlooked that many gains in these lines have been made through efforts by Negroes unaided by white co-operation. Nor are these signs of progress for the Negro an indication necessarily of better interracial relations; in some fields of gain, progress inevitably leads to conflict, especially when competition or revelation of the Negro's strength is involved.

Where the "angel" organizations have assisted, they have gone about their work for the most part quietly, avoiding chances of friction, sowing the seed of concord here and there, seeking to placate the powers that be with petitions and resolutions and counting the gains by a little won here and a little there. The very fact that the Communists have been able to awaken the interest they have in the Scottsboro case is due in part to the educational work of the "angels," who on their part are naturally more than perturbed at the thought of their apple-carts being upset by these trouble-mongers.

In fact, the "angels" have always been too easily perturbed. Timidity is the great drawback to the full accomplishment of their aims. Let no one underestimate the courage and spirit of adventure which has led individuals into this particular calling. Their task is fraught with as many dangers as the front line trenches. But unfortunately they soon become so shell-shocked by the thought of all that *could* happen, that "for the sake of the cause," in order that ground once taken may be held, no further offensives are dared, and they proceed only by cautious skirmishes. To be more specific, one or two of these organizations have refused to handle certain inflammable cases where justice should have been defended; in other cases these organizations do not attack in full force until very nearly too late. Perhaps there is not sufficient realization of the gains that have been made during the past decade; several of these groups which ten years ago were considered quite radical are now, with no change in their internal policies, regarded as quite conservative. To the accumulated knowledge and experience of the angels should be added at least a dash or two of the pioneering spirit of their energetic rival-reformists.

The next decade will see points of possible conflict developed on many fronts in interracial relations. The problems in the North are those of growing attempts at segregation, competition, discrimination and friction at points of social contacts, such as housing; in the South the Negro faces inadequacy of educational facilities, disfranchisement, prejudice in the courts, unequal labor conditions—amounting to peonage or its equivalent—segregation, lynchings and a psychological attitude which refuses to see him as a full-fledged human being.

Moreover, a different Negro faces these problems from the one who looked at his situation ten years ago. This new man has been through a period of cultural awakening. He has written, acted, sung and painted and thereby won the admiration and respect of the white group. He has been training members of his own race in the professions—medicine, teaching, law—and in business. Illiteracy has been greatly decreased. Further, the new Negro realizes that his groups as a whole must be well educated; that each member must be made to feel the importance of his role not as a slave nor yet as a Messiah, but as an average American; and, thirdly, that the leadership of his group is up to him. He has tested his strength politically and discovered that his vote is something to be taken into account—as in the case of the defeat of the nomination of John J. Parker for the Supreme Court. The Communists are making a bid for the Negro's vote, but he is not jumping at the opportunity—yet—in spite of the fact that the red wine of this doctrine has gone to the heads

of some and has made them seek the seemingly quickest way up.

The new Negro will welcome co-operation in the achievement of his citizenhood from friends who possess the qualities of social intelligence, objectivity, the urge to social justice—and courage. He does not welcome patronage and sentimentality. A co-worker with him should have an economic and political understanding of race relations, a knowledge of the full historical background of the problem, a thorough acquaintance with tested technique of social reform, dignity and consummate tact in making practical approaches, adaptability and imagination—all this combined with courage, sincerity, patience—and a sense of humor. One who plunges into the "problem" with less equipment than this is likely to prove not a helper but a meddler. It is too obvious that the field is cluttered with such meddlers at the present time.

There are many who insist that the Negro problem is an obsolete term and that what was the Negro problem is significant nowadays only insofar as it overlaps the class struggle. However that may be, it is safe to say that the wholehearted co-worker with the Negro will labor to secure for him an adequate place in whatever economic structure is built in America in the future. The Negro belongs to America and is proud of being an American. It is up to the white American, no matter to what class he belongs, to see to it that the Negro secures his share of justice and opportunity in a country which professes democracy. The Communists have pushed ahead: let the liberals push in where the way has been opened and let them hold the advantages gained and press on for equality of rights for our dark fellow-Americans.

FRANCES C. JEFFERS.

Phun with Phobias

A Cure for Insomnia

For the benefit of those who are still struggling to put their Beings in Tune with the Universe, who are convinced that There Ain't No Peace on this Earth, I am bringing myself, with infinite suffering, to transcribe some of my most vivid experiences. Let me give you a brief history of my case:

For many years—don't ask me how many, because my age is a matter of regret—I suffered from the fear, nay, the conviction, that if I sneezed the entire world would lose its balance. Only those of my own highly strung nature can fully appreciate the horror of the succeeding phases of the phobia (or have I the terms mixed?) In crowded places I might have been seen chewing formamint, one face super-imposed upon another, all in pastel shades. . . . (If you don't follow me, just read on). In empty places, or high places or low, damp places, my physician recommended lemons—you know, steaming hot—and don't go out too soon afterwards.

In summer, nothing but a filter would stop the hay fever bugs from polluting the air—so filter it was, the kind that keeps everything out, light, air, noise, heat, cold, damp, draughts—in fact, the most complete filter yet devised. But could I sleep? No, a thousand times, and with horror each time.

Why? Fear. Fear that I might sneeze; fear that the earth would rock, fear that it wouldn't rock; fear that it was rocking and that I didn't know it; fear that it was rocking and I did know it. In fact, the whole gauntlet of fears, if you know what I mean. (Or *is* it gauntlet?) My subconscious, you see, or you should see if your soul has been shattered to intangible fragments, or infrangible segments or (oh, well . . .) was afraid to sleep because it was not sleepy, due entirely to the rarified atmosphere created by the filter. Or was it due to the fear, or the lack of tune in the universe or with the universe, or was it because There Ain't No Peace for Most of Us? . . . Either one, or any.

Soon, but none too soon, I realized I must calm my spirit before going to bed or else sit up all night in that rarified atmosphere. Than which nothing. . . . But I digress.

How to attain the calm? How to . . . How to . . . Should I smoke a cigarette and further pollute the atmosphere already polluted with too great rarification (Whew!) . . . Should I take a drink and add to my fear that the world was rocking the certainty that it was? Never! I am a weakling. One more fear would have had me prostrate. Should I put on ear muffs to deaden all discordant sounds, whistle to my dog and stride forth into the night—half way down the block and back, for instance? No, for the exercise of walking upstairs was all I could stand in one evening, and I had to face the fact that I *must* walk upstairs into the rarified atmosphere sooner or later. Oh, oh, and oh!

How about some soothing music? You know . . . music seeping in at one ear, dislodging the ideas curling all about, driving them out via the other ear (if you have two ears, as I have). *The* thing, I said to myself, the *very* thing. Soft music, vernal airs and all that. And the program I tuned in on contributed "To Spring," "Spring Song," "Voices of Spring," "Spring, Beautiful Spring," "Rustle of Spring," "Spring Melody"—just the diversity and the diversion I needed . . . until (pardon me while I break down and sob for a while) my wretched subconscious hooked me up with spring fever, rose fever, hay fever. I screamed, and all was over . . . and over.

That left me poetry. So far I hadn't tried poetry as a nightcap. That is to say, not true or real poetry. Now the test for real poetry . . . but I digress.

Poetry, I said to myself (but out loud for the benefit of all of you) will be *the* thing, but it must be poetry without a single allusion to sneezing or rocking. (You follow me, I'm sure). So I weighted down my bed with anthologies and prepared for a restful night, the filter in its proper place and all. I picked up the first book.

> See the Chariot at hand here of Love,
> Wherein my Lady rideth!

Look out! She's rocking! Turn over . . .

> Or snorted we in the Seven Sleepers' den? . . .
> And now good-morrow to our waking souls,
> Which watch not one another out of fear;

Whoops! Turn over!

> I sing of Brooks, of Blossoms, Buds and Bowers;
> Of April, May, of June, and July-flowers.

Shades of wet feet! . . . Ker . . . Turn over!

Dear, dear! Apparently there are no Bell-Ans for the mind, conscious or subconscious. You never know when this insomnia will strike, either.

There's only one thing that hasn't been recommended, so the chances are that's the thing for me. How about a little fun? I mean true fun, real fun. Now the test for real fun . . . But I digress.

Let me give you a brief history of my case. . . .

CATHARINE CONRADI.

Justice for the Non-Religious

Since the Freethinker is a faithful ally of Liberal Christians in exposing and opposing invasions of religious freedom, and reactionary ecclesiasticism, it is unwise, cruel and unjust to foster any ancient prejudice against him. Even the Fundamentalists ought to hold him to be a "neighbor" within the letter and spirit of the gospel, and favor the removal of the remaining legal disabilities under which he lives.

It is difficult to understand how any one, familiar with the diversity in religious doctrines and thought, can maintain any feeling of ill will or contempt toward an atheistic workingman when we know that the latter, in the matter of his non-religious opinion, is in the same class with many of our great historians, eminent scientists, and other learned men and women, as shown by Prof. Leuba in his scholarly and authoritative "Belief in God and Immortality." Secularism is no longer, as it once was popularly presumed to be a badge of ignorance. Joseph McCabe, for example, was thoroughly trained for, and extensively experienced in, the Roman Catholic priesthood. Yet he proves himself to be an absolute atheist in his long, tedious and learned work, "The Story of Religious Controversy."

Many religious persons would be shocked if compelled to read the leaflets published by the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. They overlook, however, that such literature is not the sole repository of atheistic thought. There is extant a vast body of scholarly works, both old and recent and founded on reliable historical and scientific data, which directly or indirectly disprove a part or all of the supernaturalism taught by mediaeval theologians. Such works, not objectionable to Liberal Christians, contain matters which are readily convertible into arguments for, or proofs of, atheism. Other writings propagate atheism by insidiously suggesting its postulates, and still others encourage it in the form of presenting a philosophy. In one category may be Mencken's "Treatise on the Gods," and in the other we may have Comte's *"Philosophie Positive."*

At the outset it should be observed that the average atheist is silent concerning his opinions. Hence he does not offend any one of any class of believers. On the other hand, if he does avow his opinions, it may be found that he does not deny the existence of the Deity except by the use of materialistic terminology. He does not deny that all the marvels and manifestations in nature suggest a supreme intelligence. He simply regards it as immaterial how the same is denominated. He deems it sufficient to call it nature. Much as did the English philosopher David Hume, he believes that if there is a Supreme Being, it is one who acts with regularity and precision, unmindful of particular individuals and their opinions or mental processes, and whose laws can be ascertained by science and observation so that there can be a compliance therewith, to the benefit of mankind, as is the case with laws of health. In other words he contends: (a) that there is no God who has created a place of eternal agony for those erring in their opinion of him or concerning his attributes; (b) that there never was an original sin, and consequently that there never was any necessity for a redeemer or vicarious atonement on account thereof; and (c) that, therefore, there never was a Saviour of mankind or a divinity in human form. Why hate him for this? Such conclusions are also reached by many, if not all, Liberal Christians.

There has long been a tendency on the part of many classes of Christians, of Protestant denominations, to depart from or to forget many of the doctrinal tenets which are embodied in formularies once regarded as infallible, for example, the Westminister Confession. The result is that most of the members of the evangelical Protestant churches actually believe in no more fundamentals than do the adherents of Unitarian bodies. They have forgotten the doctrine of original sin and their respective pastors do not deem it necessary to re-educate them in it. The general public no longer worries over the heterodoxy of Unitarianism, and has but little alarm over the still more radical departure from old formularies evidenced by the as yet nebulous Humanism. Why then should any one feel like persecuting or hating those who instead of changing concepts of God and abrogating old doctrines, once deemed essential to religion, a practice now respectable under the modern trend for tolerance, prefer to deny openly the existence of a personal, punishing and rewarding Deity? The atheist simply acts according to his light, just as does the Fundamentalist, and his sincerity is evidenced by the penalties he pays for his opinions. He thinks, and he may be correct, that it is better to dispense with mere formulism entirely than to profess a belief in God when the profession is but an empty formula, as it is on the part of many who do not assume the stigma placed upon the avowed atheist.

No person will intentionally deprive himself of any available aid, forgiveness, or guidance from a Divine power, or wilfully place himself in a condition which will result in his being eternally tortured in a hell of "real fire," as described by the Rev. Charles H. Spurgeon, or receiving some other punishment beyond the grave. It follows, therefore, that if any one entertains some heterodox views in matters of theology, even as to the existence of a personal Deity, it is not a matter of choice with him any more than it is when he formulates an opinion in a matter of physics or economics.

It is impossible for any intelligent person to adopt and retain a particular religious opinion merely because it is one which is satisfactory to a majority of his neighbors and which, if openly avowed, will protect his civil rights and social standing. The result is that there are many forms of belief or disbelief. Because of the social ostracism or boycott in business inflicted upon the so called unbelievers, atheists and agnostics usually remain silent upon religious questions in order to avoid the penalties upon opinion. Hence it is that there is often a reference to a prevailing "indifference" on the part of many toward religion. Such indifference is circumstantial evidence that there is a prevalence of disbelief in the fundamental as well as in the non-essential religious doctrines. The atheist is not hounded if he simply proceeds as one of the "indifferent." If he is tempted to assail doctrines he may resort to the expedient of speaking as a "humanist" and thereby escape

the penalties risked by those who adopt the tactics of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism.

The prevalence of passive atheism is not disputed. In a recent published radio address appeared the following:

> Our boys and girls, our young men and young women, are sitting daily at the feet of professors who are teaching a materialistic philosophy—professors who deny the existence of a personal God, the spirituality of the soul, * * * the objective reality of sin, * * *.

The fact that there is a great deal of camouflaged atheism extant is one reason for refraining from persecuting the atheist who is honest enough to discard the camouflage.

Thomas Jefferson, our third president, almost encouraged young Peter Carr to become atheist when in a letter to him he wrote:

> Question with boldness even the existence of a God; * * * If it end in a belief that there is no God, you will find incitements to virtue in the comfort and pleasantness you feel in its exercise and in the love of others which it will procure for you.

The letter in full appears in the "Memoirs and Correspondence," published in 1829, edited by Thomas Jefferson Randolph.

No longer are even the evangelical Christians horrified over the supposed errors of Jews, Christian Scientists, Friends, Unitarians, Universalists, or other religious minorities. Eventually non-religious classes will not be stigmatized. At one time the Fundamentalist ancestors of many of us were both willing and anxious to extirpate Unitarians as well as Unitarianism. In moulding the common law, and in enacting some statutes, they made it a crime to deny "the doctrine of the Holy Trinity." The horror in which such Unitarianism as held by five or more presidents of the United States was viewed is evidenced by the following expressions of Attorney General Sir Vicary Gibbs when prosecuting Daniel Isaac Eaton:

> He denies the miracles, the divinity, the resurrection, and the ascension of our Saviour; he contradicts His existence as the Son of God: * * *
>
> We are not proceeding against the defendant * * * for an offense as serious to the well-being of society, as any that can possibly be imagined. * * * Ought not he be called on to answer for *so foul a crime?*

After John Biddle published some of his anti-Trinitarian books, the Presbyterians in the English Parliament caused the enactment, in 1648, an Ordinance which provided the death penalty for those denying the doctrine of the Trinity. The following year a like provision appeared in the legislation of Maryland, in this country. If our late illustrious fellow citizen William Howard Taft, whose memory we all revere, had lived in Maryland at that time and had then publicly expressed his Unitarian opinions, he would have been amenable to execution as a felon.

The battle line of dogmatic theology and its apologists has gradually receded, in defeat, until the only open warfare became, as it now is, confined to the one heresy commonly denominated "atheism." To carry on even this contest is to emulate the perished ecclesiastical tyrants whose memory is abhorred by most of mankind. There is no longer, if there ever was, any excuse for continuing in existence the laws, in force in a few states, which impose legal disabilities upon non-religious persons.

FRANK SWANCARA.

Trumpets on New Horizons

A Challenge to Christianity

Say, what are these rumors of children who drill
To clarion bugles and drums?
From all the far ends of the universe
An affirmative echoing comes.

Listen . . . a martial rhythm of feet!
Look . . . a glitter of steel!
Guns in boys' hands? Weapons of death?
This is fantastic . . . unreal!

Flags should be beautiful symbols of peace;
Young souls should be cast in a mould,
Not of terror and hate, but of laughter and love—
The blood runs suddenly cold

As sweet treble voices chant anthems of war!
O Nations, in God's holy name,
Rise up and demand such infamies cease,
Or forever wear stigmas of shame!

ETHEL ROMIG FULLER.

Merciful Decoration

Heap flowers high upon their mounds today
Who died inspired by words as brave as they.
"To end—" the phrase began; who could have guessed
That time would be so quick to still the rest?

Heap flowers high upon their honored mounds
To blanket out our treachery—the sounds
Of Mars once more haranguing restless men
And Vulcan's anvil clanging loud again.

JOHN URBANEK.

War Is a Stage

War is a stage where puppets dance,
Pulled by the strings of high finance;
War is a masquerade of fools,
Where souls are beaten into tools.
War is a stench of blood and lust,
Where sweet young bodies turn to dust,
When Death in fury, rides the land,
Hate's scepter held in hollow hand.
So long as Godless graft abounds,
War's blast will drown all sweeter sounds.

HARRIET MARKHAM GILL.

A Street Musician

He plays the violin. His useless eyes
Are fixed upon the whirling dark of space,
His shell-shocked ears can sense the cannon cries
In every noise—the hurt of nations lies
In all the shattered youth within his face.

He plays the violin. And through the song
We hear the stark brutality of hells
Erected out of swaggered hate and wrong,
The arrogance of patriots, the strong
With vacant souls—the savage tide that swells!

ROBERTA MEYERS.

A Beggar Answers

Begging? God! man, I need the money quick.
D'you think I stand and shiver here for fun?
My kids need shoes; they're hungry, too, and sick.
I won't move on! Pull out your filthy gun!

They've cut me off, and off, and off, until
There's nothing left to cut, unless my soul
Long dead, can bring them gain, and fill
Their coffers up to swell the ghastly toll.

Hell! I was patriotic once, not now.
Then why am I a mutilated clown,
While some vile lady-kissing fool, with care-free brow
Draws his six thousand golden dollars down?

I won't move on! I'll see you first in hell,
With other guys that have no souls to sell.

FLORENCE EAKMAN.

The Study Table

War Clouds in the Skies of the Far East*

During recent years among the publicists of the West there have been many who prophesied war in the Far East. Some thought that Japan and Russia would fight for the Manchurian railway (Chinese Eastern Railway, now sold to Manchukuo by the Soviet Russian Government, in spite of protests of the Chinese Government which claimed part ownership in it), or to check Japanese expansion in Manchuria. Others think that the United States should take leadership for a movement for an Anglo-American-Chinese-Russian combination to crush Japanese imperialism. Still others think that it is the mission of the English speaking world (through a virtual Anglo-American Alliance) to save the world hegemony of the "white peoples," by crushing Japan, the leader of the yellow or colored races. Some of these journalists, enjoying the reputation of being authorities on Far Eastern affairs have expressed in their recent books the view that do what you may, the United States cannot avoid a war with Japan. They have urged that the United States should be ready to fight Japan or she will be forced to give up all opportunities for legitimate commerce in the Far East. These writers think that an American-Japanese war is inevitable and is a matter of time. Under the circumstances it is rather fortunate that an American scholar and patriot has realistically discussed the Far Eastern situation with vigor, candor and insight, recognizing the fact that there are war clouds in the skies of the Far East. Mr. Ireland however does not think that an American-Japanese war is unavoidable; on the contrary he after careful analysis of the various phases of the Far Eastern situation comes to the conclusion that without sacrificing America's vital interests to Japan an American-Japanese war can be avoided but only by pursuing a definite policy of non-interference with Japan's policy of national expansion, which is essential for Japan's very existence as a nation.

After analyzing the Chinese situation Mr. Ireland comes to the conclusion that China, under the present condition of the country, cannot be an effective ally of the United States in a war against Japan. Soviet Russia, for her own interests—for the solution of her internal social, economic and political problems and also for the protection of her territorial integrity in Europe —will not be willing to fight Japan now. Nor is it conceivable that Russia would help the United States in a Japanese-American war just to help the American Republic. The policy of Great Britain has been and is to play with Japan and the United States simultaneously. British statesmen will prefer to settle all the differences with Japan, even revive a form of an Anglo-Japanese Alliance (by signing an Anglo-Japanese non-aggression pact), provided Japan and Great Britain can come to a working understanding regarding mutual co-operation in the Far East. Mr. Ireland writes:—

> War between the United States and Japan would be far more agreeable to British policy than a war between Great Britain and Japan. Such a conflict would severely test the loyalty of India to the Empire. On the other hand, a conflict between the United States and Japan would enable the League of Nations powers to carry on with both combatants a rich trade. (p. 156.)

He further writes regarding the Anglo-American co-operation against Japan as follows:—

> In regard to an understanding between Great Britain and the United States, how closely can the two English-speaking countries come together to meet the situation that will be created by Japan's denouncing the Washington Five-Power Treaty that has controlled the navies of all three as to capital ships in the last thirteen years? The United States and Great Britain failed to work together when Japan was acting in Manchuria. At the London naval conversations in November, 1934, there were unfortunately found to be many obstacles to the practical solution of the naval problem, in the nature of controversies on war debts, currencies and trade, that prevented the perfect co-operation required and the presenting of a united front of the two English-speaking nations to Japan.
>
> The Imperial Conference at Ottawa in 1932 in the effort to make the British Empire more of an economic unit had caused the raising of English duties against products of the United States. The agreement of 1933 between Great Britain and Argentina, whereby cash of the Latin American country was set aside for British trade, made more difficult the payment by Argentina for American products. Then there has been a reluctance on the part of both England and of the United States to negotiate an agreement for the stabilization of currencies. Then, further, there has been the unwillingness of this country to make any fundamental concessions on war debts such as was England's policy with its debtor-allies of the Napoleonic wars.
>
> In view of all these considerations it is easily to be conceived that this country could become involved in a war with Japan, without Great Britain's seeing fit to participate as our ally. (page 434.)

Mr. Ireland realizes that the United States Government under President Franklin D. Roosevelt is virtually following the policy enunciated by the former Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson. He suggests that American statesmen should make up their mind about avoiding a war with Japan. Mr. Ireland is not a so-called pro-Japanese. On the contrary, he strongly advocates exclusion of the Japanese from the United States and suggests that there should be steps taken so that more Japanese women may not come to the United States to aid the process of growing Japanese population in this country. However he denounces ill-treatment of Japanese who are already in the United States. He writes:—

> In the late summer of 1934, it was reported through the country that farmers from the Salt River Valley of Arizona were parading with banners telling the Japanese to leave or be forcibly put out, the sort of outrage that occurred in California about twenty years ago. Granting that Japanese immigration should properly be excluded from the United States, on one point there must be full agreement among Americans of all groups and that is the duty of American governing bodies and of American citizens in our western states to give those people of Japanese racial origin who have already been permitted to enter here exactly the same protection that is accorded to all residents of the United States. Failure to do so is not only a breach of international duty on the part of such governing bodies; it is a breach of man-to-man decency and humanity. (pp. 317-318.)

Mr. Ireland does not believe in the validity of Japanese demand for *racial equality,* because the Japanese themselves do not extend equal treatment to the Chinese, Koreans, Formosans and others. But Mr. Ireland believes that it is most vital for Japan with her ever-increasing population to have an outlet for expansion. Japanese expansion to Manchuria and Japanese commercial expansion in other parts of China are not against American interests. In fact America's commercial interest with Japan is far more important than the rest of the Orient.

The United States can exercise her sovereign rights in excluding the Japanese from her shores; but if the United States interferes with Japanese expansion in Manchuria it would not be tolerated by the Japanese. In fact America's refusal to recognize the changed status

*"War Clouds in the Skies of the Far East." By Tom Ireland. New York. Putnam. 1935. Pages 451.

of Manchukuo and advocacy of an Anglo-American cooperation to coerce Japan, has led to Japanese demand for naval equality so that she would be able to defend herself in the Far East against any combination of naval powers. If America wishes that Japan should give up her demands regarding naval equality, then she should recognize Japanese supremacy in Manchuria. Mr. Ireland presents the Japanese view on the question of naval parity with clarity and without bias. He feels that if Great Britain can justly claim her naval supremacy in the North Sea and the Mediterranean and certain other parts of the world, if the United States is determined to uphold her naval superiority in American waters, similarly Japan can claim her naval predominance in the Far Eastern waters. Japanese determination to do so has intimate connection with her recent declaration of her Asiastic Monroe Doctrine.

The question of granting independence to the people of the Philippines is of vital importance to the United States. If the United States decides to challenge Japanese supremacy in the Far East, then the Philippines and other islands should be properly fortified. On the other hand if the United States decides to grant independence to the Philippine Islands then she should not have any naval base there, which may only serve as a source of trouble with Japan. Those who advocate the maintenance of a naval base in the Philippines think that unless the United States does so Japan may establish her supremacy in the islands. What Japan does in the Philippines after the granting of independence should not be the concern of the United States. The author recognizes the need of developing and strengthening the naval base in the Hawaiian Islands and building up the U. S. navy to the full strength, but any effort to build a naval base in the Aleutian Islands would be a provocative act against Japan. He writes:—

> With utmost deference to the plan of the President to bring the navy up to Washington and London Treaty limits and to replace each of our fifteen battleships with newer dreadnoughts if the existing treaties are not continued, it seems there is no reason at this time to "force" us to race in building navies. The failure of the London naval conversations, November, 1934, to achieve definite results, even Japan's denunciation of the Five-power Treaty, are not compelling. . . .
>
> The Tokyo newspaper *Jiji Shimpo,* usually well informed on naval matters, indicated in September, 1934, that Japan was planning an aviation base in the Kuriles or northern Hokkaido near the northern extremity of the empire if the United States establishes an Alaskan naval base. In the American decision to develop the Alaskan angle of the program of national defense in so far as fleet maneuvers are concerned, there is no reason to alarm Japan since this procedure is simply in line with the navy's policy of the last decade of holding its naval concentrations in American territorial waters.
>
> The building of a naval base, however, at Unalaska or elsewhere in the Aleutian Islands, would be a very different matter. Since its purpose could not possibly be any other than to make war on Japan—the distance from the Aleutian Islands is 2,051 miles to San Francisco and 2,547 miles to Yokohama—it would be an unequivocally hostile act; in fact, daring Japan to come. It seems unfortunate that this country should take so drastic a step with no better justification than that a friendly power was exercising its sovereign right of declining to agree to an inferior naval status and of building as many small war craft as it chose and as its limited means would permit, not to menace this country in any way but only to tend its own affairs in its own way-off quarter of the globe. (pages 424-426.)

There are war clouds in the skies of the Far East; but an American-Japanese War is not inevitable. It can be avoided if statesmen of Japan and the United States decide to mind their own affairs in their respective spheres. In fact a war between the United States and Japan would be a calamity for both the nations and would serve no purpose but the destruction of their commerce and the unnecessary sacrifice of precious human lives.

Mr. Ireland's work is a valuable contribution to the growing literature on Far Eastern affairs. The book written is so simple that a man in the street can understand the intricate problems of international relations of the Far East.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Oliver's Secretary

An age of philosophic radicalism, which, while it persistently destroys its own nascent Utopias or perverts them into corporate dictatorships, nevertheless yearns after the rainbow of perfection, can scarcely fail to appreciate Rose Macaulay's recent pictorial resurrection for John Milton,* England's great philosophic Radical—seeing that this work is the best yet to appear on its subject, we shall devote some leisure to recreating it for our readers, and to portraying, as best we may, the personality of Oliver's secretary: poet and pamphleteer, author of "Paradise Lost" and "Tetrachordon," world voice of the Republican cause, then, in the seventeenth century, now, in the twentieth, and forevermore, throughout all centuries.

A resounding trumpet crash (like Gabriel's) rouses the mighty protagonist from his two centuries' repose, and places him on an appropriate stage, compounded of Elizabethan pageantry and Doric Puritanism: then, with a poetic lightness of touch, an aery humor, and a sense of sublimity rivaling Walter Raleigh's "Shakespeare," the dramatist succinctly tells her story. To enumerate the already familiar details of that life is a harmless superfluity: early precosity in the arts; university days marked by studious contempt for "Alma Mater"; first fieldglings of immortality: "Nativity Ode," "The Nightingale," "On Arriving at Twenty-three," "L'Allegro," "Il Penseroso," "Comus," "Lycidas." Italian rambles and sonnets; return to England, followed by marriage fiascoes and instant immersion in the Cromwellian thunders of England's tumult, above which Milton's organ tones rise trumphant, proclaiming the downfall of thrones and altars, as well as the eternal liberty of the individual human soul, acknowledging sovereignity to none but the King of Kings. Then catastrophe, after the death of Oliver Protector (as whose secretary he had composed his immortal mandate on behalf of the persecuted Vaudois, and his valedictorial "Avenge, O Lord"), together with poverty, hiding, and blindness—and, in solitude, with darkness and dangers encompassed, the defiant old Radical, balked of his earthly aspirations, sets about building within his own frustrated soul that house of many mansions which God had decreed but which the world denied, where Truth and Justice should rule supreme, and "Mercy between, throned in celestial sheen," should temper the despotism of principle with the goodness of love. . . . Such is the story which Rose Macaulay set herself to tell: and anyone who will attend her faithfully must admit she has told it well, with all deserved opportunities for general success. A play having Milton for its hero, Oliver Cromwell as support, and the Puritan Revolution as accompaniment, besides light snatches of Herrick's songs, colorful interludes in masque by Ben Jonson; done with such deftness and finesse as this one, can hardly fail to please—nor will it.

*"Milton." By Rose Macaulay. Published by Harper, 1935. $2.00.

And more than please. For, *Deus Ex Machina* to the whole, deepening and dominating everything, is Milton himself, who haunts and overshadows the remotest reaches of the scene: grand, gloomy, peculiar as Napoleon in his palmiest days, an unbelievable colossus (to take an overworked word) of conceit, learning, vainglory, repression, and overweening pride, fearful and wonderful as his own poetic tower of terrors and lost paradises. We thank the author for presenting us to him in so fine a fashion, and we bid them both affectionate farewell, with the feeling that never before has anything quite so badly needed been so magnificently supplied: a work worthy place (as before hinted) beside Raleigh and Lord Morley's volumes in *English Men of Letters* series, where biography kisses hands with perfection.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

Good Sermons

Dr. Frederick K. Stamm, author of this book,* is one of the best known preachers in New York today. He has collected in this volume a careful selection of his sermons. I do not read many volumes of sermons, and keep still fewer in my library. But this book I have read, and I shall give it place upon my shelves. It is a fortunate congregation that is privileged to listen to preaching of this exceptional quality.

The titles of some of the ten sermons gathered in the volume will show the range of Dr. Stamm's interest. The title of the book itself is significant, as showing the preacher's thoroughly modern approach to religious problems. The basis of his thought is not theology but life. On this foundation he rears his discussions of such topics as "The Religion of a College Student," "The Plumb Line of Character," "Experience Worketh What?" "Can We Trust God to Do the Right?" "The Society of Fools," and "The Useful Hosts of Mediocrity."

Dr. Stamm has a feeling for the common man, and an understanding of his necessities. At the same time he has clear insight into fundamental principles of thought and life, and a vision that holds fast to ideals. He discusses profound problems without pretension, and yet with easy mastery. A simple style never descends to carelessness or mere colloquialism. Always there is dignity, with unfailing clarity. This is a book of sermons to be highly commended to those who would know and profit from the excellent preaching of our day.

J. H. H.

*"Through Experience to Faith." By Frederick K. Stamm. Published by the Abington Press. $1.50.

"Through a Broken Reed"

John Dewey tells us that the imaginative pioneering of the poet has made possible the advances of humanity. By showing that patterns of thought may be changed, the poet helps mankind to realize the possibilities of pushing back mental horizons and entering a new world.

Elsa Tudor is such a pioneer. Keenly alive to the tragedies and injustices of our times, she strikes major chords of poetry in the sympathetic poems on Sacco and Vanzetti and Gandhi and her prayer for disarmament. Her little brochure, "Through a Broken Reed,†" contains also highly personal lyrics and several charming nature poems—all of them showing a beautiful awareness of the unity of life.

Mrs. Tudor's work is stronger in substance than in style, but her poems should give pleasure to a host of readers.

LUCIA TRENT.

†"Through a Broken Reed." By Elsa Tudor. Published by Richard G. Badger, The Gorham Press, Boston, Mass.

Correspondence

An Open Letter to President Roosevelt

Hon. Franklin Delano Roosevelt,
President of the United States of America,
Washington, D. C.
Dear Mr. President:

We are proud of you for having condemned the assassination of Senator Long with your words:

> The spirit of violence is un-American and has no place in a consideration of public affairs, least of all at a time when calm and dispassionate approach to the difficult problems of the day is so essential.

Now we even dare to hope that if, and when the pressure is applied to try to get America into a war of violence on the plea that it is necessary to remove some other dictator, not of America, we may find that you will still insist that "The spirit of violence is un-American and has no place in a consideration of public affairs," when those affairs are international in character.

We are going to hope that at last we have a President who will insist that all attempts made upon the lives of our boys in a war that profiteers cook up are un-American, for America has pledged her sacred honor in the Paris Peace Pact to all nations "that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought, except by pacific means."

As you have so well stated it in regard to this horrible attack upon one dictator in an American state, so we hope and trust that you may remain strong and determined enough to insist equally in the international field that "The spirit of violence is un-American and has no place in a consideration of public affairs" between nations.

Yours, reassured,
GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.
Bullville, N. Y.

Protests to Russia

To the Editor of UNITY:

A current news item is enough to make a cat laugh, if the issues concerned were not so serious. The Latvian consul gravely protested, along with the representatives of Britain and the United States, against the resolutions passed by the comintern (Communist International) as an interference with Latvia's internal affairs. Anna Louise Strong, in the *New Republic,* lately answered a question regarding the executions that followed Kirov's assassination. She said:

> One hundred and three persons were executed as members of murder gangs who crossed the Soviet border with revolvers and hand grenades to commit acts of violence against Communists and Soviet officials. Such gangs have existed ever since the revolution drove out the White Guard armies, but Berlin gave them shelter after Hitler came to power. They

have for two years been bragging in newspapers published in Berlin and Jugoslavia of their successes in murder and destruction beyond the Soviet frontier. Today the whole world knows about Nazi terrorist tactics across frontiers

These cases were handled by border guards until the assassination of Kirov aroused a storm of popular resolutions calling for drastic action against terrorists. A court-martial composed of well-known members of the Supreme Court thereupon made a rapid clean-up of all these cases in several cities, publishing the fact that the terrorists had been armed when arrested, had run the border from Poland and Roumania, and had plotted and carried out murders. The trials were in camera, since open discussion of details was tantamount to accusing several governments of acts that rank as causes of war.

In the Kirov case itself, fourteen persons were executed, who confessed that they had formed a "Leningrad Center" to assassinate Soviet leaders. They connected abroad through the Latvian consul-general, who on evidence shown was recalled by his government.

The Latvian consul-general who protested the other day was the successor to the one who was lately recalled for cause.

C. M. G.

Boston, Massachusetts.

From a Friend's Correspondence

Dear ————

How much I enjoyed the Memorial Number of UNITY which you so thoughtfully sent. Jane Addams has been one of my ideals and to have her whole career summed up in the way that issue did is better than a biography written by one person. I passed the copy to our Provost and his wife, both of whom have worked with Miss Addams in Hull House. . . .

M. L. M.

Los Angeles, California.

"The Fascination of the Sea"

Editor of UNITY:

How I did enjoy Dr. Sunderland's "The Fascination of the Sea," in the issue of August 19. And in the same issue I rejoiced to see Lucia Trent's "Blazers of Brotherhood."

Blessings on UNITY and all who make it.

AGNES H. HARDY.

Newllano, La.

More Appreciation

Editor of UNITY:

I hope that the Jane Addams Memorial Number of UNITY is not yet exhausted for I wish three copies of it. Way back in 1924 one of my Seniors in Chester, Vermont, a girl of Finnish parentage, wrote her graduation essay on Jane Addams. It was a developing experience for this girl to become acquainted with the work of Jane Addams. One instance of the infinite extent of the influence of Miss Addams and Hull House.

DOROTHY T. WILDER.

Melrose, Mass.

Note

The article in the issue of September 2 by Dr. Taraknath Das, "Two Eminent Americans," was not seen by Editor Holmes previous to its appearance in UNITY's columns. The Managing Editor takes responsibility for the publication of this excellent tribute by an Indian to Drs. Sunderland and Holmes, both of whom have greatly befriended India.—C. W. R.

The Field

(*Continued from page 42*)

of liquor in moderation are those who want to sell it. I do not look upon it as any method for the solution of the problem of liquor in American life."

Albert W. Palmer, D.D., LL.D., President, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago: "The proposal of the Council for Moderation seems to me to involve more of danger than of hope because it ignores the fact that small amounts of alcohol are in some ways more dangerous than large ones. A man too drunk to drive a car at all is far less dangerous than a man with just enough alcohol in his system to disturb his accuracy of judgment and make him reckless. . . . The same thing applies to keeping a clear head in the face of moral temptations. Personally I believe there is no satisfactory alternative to the use of alcohol except total abstinence."

Walter Dill Scott, Ph.D., LL.D., President, Northwestern University, Evanston, Chicago, Ill.: "Personally, I am opposed to moderate drinking largely because of the tendency for moderation to develop into excess. I was of the opinion that the Prohibition laws would never be repealed. I thought they could be enforced. We were assured that with the repeal of the Prohibition laws the old-fashioned saloon would never be permitted to come back. It is back. I am convinced that there was less drinking in America during the so-called Prohibition era than either before or since that era. It is hard for me to believe that temperance can be had in America at all. Either total abstinence or excessive drinking seem to be the two alternatives available for us.

Anthony Zeleny, Ph.D., Professor of Physics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis: "I believe the only solution of the liquor problem is the total elimination of liquor as a beverage. The propaganda for "moderate drinking" is most unfortunate and can lead to nothing but disastrous results. It must be combated with the greatest possible vigor. . . ."

John Haynes Holmes, D.D., Lecturer, and Minister, The Community Church, New York City: "I am emphatically opposed to any suggestion that we abandon the support of total abstinence from alcoholic liquors and henceforth favor and encourage a policy of habitual moderate indulgence. This way destruction lies. There can be no compromise in this fight. We must take our stand upon the basic principle of total abstinence. . . . The current plea for moderate drinking is nothing more nor less than an indication that our wet friends are scared to death over what a year of new experience with the liquor traffic is demonstrating. We are moving right back into chaos, and these wets know that this means a swing of public sentiment back to Prohibition. The wets want to forestall this, and so they resort to this miserable and dangerous subterfuge. The whole thing should be fought as we would fight a snake. Keep up the good work."

Hon. Arthur Capper, U. S. Senator from Kansas: "I am unqualifiedly opposed to the movement inaugurated by the 'Council for Moderation.' I think any 'campaign of education to promote moderate use of all alcoholic liquors' will be harmful rather than helpful to the cause of temperance. . . ."

Rev. T. O. Burntvedt, President, The Lutheran Free Church, Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.:

"I believe that the launching of a movement to promote moderate use of alcoholic liquors will not serve to diminish the use of such liquors by the people of the United States. It will on the other hand, in a subtle way, be destructive to the work for temperance and total abstinence, and it will be welcomed by all those who profit financially by the liquor traffic. . . ."

W. C. Dennis, LL.D., President Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.: "I can only say that I believe in total abstinence as the only safe and practical principle of personal conduct. . . . In my judgment . . . the general result of encouraging moderate drinking would be materially to increase rather than to decrease drinking as a whole and it would therefore have unfortunate results. . . ."

J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., President, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.: "I am absolutely opposed to the use of alcoholic liquors in any form and in any quantity. . . ."

Hon. Charles F. Scott, former Congressman, and publisher, "Iola Daily Register," Iola, Kans.: "The proposal sponsored by Dr. Butler and others is a challenge to the whole temperance movement in America. Whatever the purpose may be, the practical effect of such a campaign as the 'Moderationists' propose would be enormously to increase the number of drink addicts in America, to expand the liquor traffic and increase its political power by giving it a degree of respectability which the public sentiment of our country has rightly denied it for more than half a century."

Charles J. Turck, A.B., LL.B., President, Central College, Danville, Ky.: "In my judgment, the adoption of the 'moderate drinking' attitude would have a most serious adverse effect on the motor traffic accident problem, social welfare in our large centers, industrial efficiency, the future of youth and family life, college life and on educational and religious progress. . . ."

Right Rev. Samuel Benedict, Bishop of Old Catholic Church, Los Angeles, Calif.: "The universal adoption of 'moderate drinking' would be a national calamity of the first magnitude. The drinking of alcoholic beverages is the greatest curse that ever afflicted humanity. . . ."

"Total abstinence from all alcoholic beverages, by every person in America, is the only final solution of the liquor curse problem."

Edgar J. Fisher, Ph.D., Lecturer on International Affairs, former Professor of History and Political Science, Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey.: "For the enlightened citizen of today there is real danger in adopting the 'moderate drinking' attitude. Our Christian attitude should be to strive earnestly for total abstinence, and make this a matter of uncompromising personal principle. . . . The liquor traffic is a dangerous threat to our social and religious ideals, and to our hopes of progress. Not the encouragement of moderate drinking is our need today, but earnest work and efforts to educate our youth to total abstinence, and to impress upon the elders the absolute need of furnishing a decent and consistent example in this respect. This is a patriotic crusade of primary importance."

Silas Evans, D.D., LL.D., President, Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.: "Moderate drinking needs no organized encouragement. In the nature of the case, the use of alcohol has a strong tendency toward excess, which leads to very apparent personal and social evil effects. I can see no constructive value in encouraging a temperate use of alcoholic beverages. . . . I would gladly endorse and support any movement which teaches positively in a sane and scientific way the evil effects of alcohol, and trust that the effort may lead to the most desirable result of all, namely, total abstinence."

Edward S. Parsons, LL.D., President, Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio: "I feel it would be a great calamity for Christian and allied thought in America to abandon the support of total abstinence from alcoholic liquors as a principle of personal attitude toward intoxicants, and henceforth favor and encourage a policy of habitual, moderate indulgence in these beverages. . . . The moderate drinking attitude would have a very serious, detrimental effect upon our American life. It would complicate our motor problem; lower standards of social welfare and industrial efficiency; be detrimental to youth, to the family, to college life and to education in general and to religious progress. My position is entirely unequivocal on these points."

Dr. Milton Conover, Professor of Political Science, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.: "Enlightened Christian and allied thought in America should not abandon the support of total abstinence from alcoholic liquors."

Robert A. Woods, General Grand Master, General Grand Council of Royal and Select Masters: "The formation of a 'Council for Moderation' to teach moderate drinking, does not at all accord with my ideas of Christian citizenship. There will continue to be a large class of moderate drinkers, and any organized movement to endorse or extend moderate drinking in this country, to my mind, is exceptionally reprehensible. . . . The youth of our land should be educated to abstain from intoxicants of every sort."

Wallace B. Fleming, Ph.D., D.D., President, Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.: "The questions as to whether moderate drinking would affect motor traffic accidents, or social welfare, or industrial efficiency, or the interests of youth and the family life, or college life, or religious and educational progress are not matters of personal opinion. Anybody who wants the facts can easily get them. . . . America cannot drink herself to soberness."

Hon. Simeon D. Fess, former Senator from Ohio: "The suggestion of a campaign on behalf of moderate drinking in the interest of sound temperance is extremely offensive to people opposed to the evils of intoxicating drinks. I hardly think I need specify the objections, they are so obvious."

Dr. A. A. Shaw, President, Denison University, Granville, Ohio: "In my judgment it would be a serious step backward for Christian people of America to abandon efforts toward total abstinence from alcoholic liquors as a beverage and to cease our efforts toward a complete prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicants. . . ."

Jack Finegan, Minister, Church of Christ, Ames, Iowa: "Moderate-drinking can only accentuate every social problem and retard ethical advance."

J. S. Willett, Treasurer, Wesleyan Methodist Publishing Association (official paper, Wesleyan Methodist Church): "In our opinion the dangers to motor traffic will be mul-

tiplied by the extension of this educational process of moderate drinking. . . Social welfare needs will be tremendously multiplied as they always have been where liquor more generally abounds. It cannot help but diminish the effectiveness and the efficiency of industry, and as to the future of our youth and American ideals of family life, it is almost appalling to contemplate what it would mean for every family to adopt the idea of moderation."

Robert A. Straughn, Student Editor, "Flashlight," student paper, State Teachers College, Mansfield, Pa.: "The worst problem created by alcohol results from the formation of the alcoholic habit in youth. And what could be more conducive to creating this habit in youth than to admit it in 'moderation'. . . ."

Rev. Jay T. Stocking, D.D., Pilgrim Congregational Church, St. Louis, Mo.: "I believe most heartily that 'enlightened Christian and allied thought' must not abandon the principle of total abstinence. . . . A campaign in behalf of moderate drinking means a campaign in behalf of liquor. The effect of moderate drinking upon motor accidents is not difficult to see. Nor is it difficult to see its effects on industrial efficiency. . . ."

Cale K. Burgess, First Commander, North Carolina Department, American Legion: "It is my opinion that the activities of the Moderation Council will be hurtful to the cause of sobriety in America. The attitude of the individual towards strong drink should be that of total abstinence and the policy of Government should be that of Prohibition. Adoption of the 'moderate drinking' attitude would create the following undesired results: (1) The motor traffic accident problem would be greatly aggravated; (2) the domestic and social evils of strong drink would be increased; (3) the harmful effects of drinking upon the industrial efficiency of our people would be enlarged and increased; (4) the debauching and demoralizing effects of strong drink on the ideals and the moral stability of our people would be increased; (5) the promulgation and practice of the moderate drinking idea among college students would be disastrous in many ways; and (6) the educational and religious life of our nation would be greatly handicapped. . . ."

Hon. Morris Sheppard, U. S. Senator from Texas: "In my judgment we American people have no place for so-called moderate drinking in our civilization. There is no such thing as the 'moderate' drinking of alcoholic beverages in the sense that such beverages can be taken at all without immediate or ultimate harm. The effect of alcohol on the human system, acting on the nerves and brain, is such that the only safe and sane methods of its control are outright Prohibition and outright abstinence. . . . I am more thoroughly convinced than ever, after seeing the effect of the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, that National Prohibition is an economic and social necessity and will inevitably return."

Mrs. Catharine Waugh McCulloch, Lawyer, Chicago: "Organized encouragement and adoption of a moderate drinking attitude as a universal policy for the American public would *increase* the difficulties of the motor traffic accident problem; *diminish, lessen* social welfare in our large centers, *lower* industrial efficiency, *lessen* the number of college youth, *lower* student grades, adversely affect sports; *injure* and *retard* education and religious progress."

Arthur M. Millard, President and Grand Master Builder, Order of Builders, Chicago: "Specifically answering your questions: First—No. Second—It would be destructive and dangerous in the extreme in all of the six points that you enumerate, and would be a great step back in every way. . . ."

Frank E. Gannett, President, Gannett Newspapers, Rochester, N. Y.: "The history of the liquor traffic shows that alcohol is a habit-forming drug and that a large percentage of the moderate drinkers become intemperate drinkers. All the preaching in the world will not change physical reaction. . . . The only solution of the liquor traffic is total abstinence. . . ."—*The Union Signal,* Evanston, Illinois.

"The supreme issue, involving all others, is the encroachment of the powerful few upon the rights of the many."—ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE SR.

LaFOLLETTE'S

GREAT NATIONAL WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

THE PROGRESSIVE

Founded 1909, Regular Price $1.50 Per Year

Why do newspapers fool the public by distorting and suppressing news?

What is the PRACTICAL method of bringing about a real redistribution of the wealth of this nation so that every person will have a fair share?

What is the real story behind the so-called defenders of the constitution, the American Liberty league, and other similar agencies?

Get the answers to these and other vital questions from The Progressive.

DON'T BE MISLED OR UNINFORMED — THE PROGRESSIVE WILL BRING YOU THE FACTS AND THE PROOF!

Two Big Special Offers

1 Year (52 Issues) $1

10 Weeks (10 Issues) 20c

The Progressive is a unique publication. It accepts no paid advertising. It is therefore free from big business influence. It seeks to serve only its readers.

Facts suppressed by other papers exposed in every issue. Inside story of the new third party. How the La Follettes would break the depression and solve our economic problems. Many more sensational features DON'T MISS THE NEXT FEW STARTLING ISSUES! ORDER TODAY!

THE PROGRESSIVE Dept. 34 Madison, Wis.